

government candidates and contributors. Again, if the value could be shown to us, this could be justified. Again, no proof has been suggested.

Thirdly, elections should be a special event in the lives of the citizens, not a continuous process.

Fourthly, high turnouts increase the pressure on candidates to devote more energy to issues rather than gimmicks and gross publicity.

Fifth, less frequent elections permit greater degree of average citizen participation.

Sixth, governmental issues and political office holders at one level can never, no matter what we do here, be insulated from the issues and office holders of other levels. Intergovernmental realities speak too clearly to the contrary.

Seventh, elections in three of every four years force office holders at all levels of governments to devote still more time to politics than to their job responsibilities and also encourage one to use one office level as a platform or launching pad to another the following year.

Finally, if there were elections in two of every four years, the administrators of elections would have a much easier task in formulating policies, record-keeping and analysis of election results.

Mr. Chairman, I would like to call upon and yield three minutes to Delegate Beatrice Miller.

THE CHAIRMAN: I will recognize her at a later time.

Delegate Schloeder.

DELEGATE SCHLOEDER: Mr. Chairman, ladies and gentlemen: It is very interesting that in this amendment that we have before us we seem to have a very basic contradiction. All the arguments that were given by Delegate Byrnes in support of his position somehow overlook the fact that there is this contradiction.

He says Baltimore City should have three elections in every four years, but the rest of the subdivisions would have two elections in every four years.

I am not too clear how this contradiction can be resolved. If all these arguments that he gives are valid arguments, it would seem to me that these arguments would be as valid for Baltimore City as they would be for the counties.

He seems for the first time in this Convention to be asking for an exception for Baltimore City. But more to the logic and reasoning of the argument, I just find it very difficult to believe that for some strange reason the political climate of Baltimore City is immune to those seven fine reasons against having three elections in four years.

Before we begin, I would like to point to that basic contradiction, so that you can be very clear in your own mind as to what this amendment would do. I would yield at a later time to those who have indicated interest to speak.

THE CHAIRMAN. Delegate Beatrice Miller.

DELEGATE B. MILLER: Mr. Chairman, and fellow delegates: I rise in support of the amendment and the Minority Report.

Those of you who have watched me on the floor know I am usually not reluctant to change. I am not particularly an advocate of the status quo, but I see no reason to change merely for change's sake.

I have heard and I have listened. I have spoken to a great many delegates. I find none who will tell us how it will be better by changing what we have and, therefore, I cannot see any real reason to change it.

Those of us who have worked in the past with voluntary organizations on elections know how difficult it is to get the support of those people and to ask them time after time, year after year, to devote the kind of hard work, sacrifice, and hours that they do freely each year. We fear that if we go into yearly elections, we will be faced with a more mechanized kind of machine, a paid kind of operation because we do not think we can get the kind of volunteer support we have been accustomed to up to the present time.

This is my very strongest reason for advocating that we stay with what we have and the kinds of operation we are having and to which our people are accustomed to volunteering more time and effort, but I do not think we could ask people to do this on a yearly basis.

I would also submit that a yearly election would remove an aura of stability that we have in terms of government. We would constantly be discussing who gets in and who got out. We would constantly be attempting to adjust the newly elected to the positions in which they are elected. We would constantly be having a strain on government in accommodating new people.